



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,526	10/12/1999	ERKKO LEHTONEN	367.37732X00	6275

20457 7590 04/23/2003

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS  
SUITE 1800  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

TORRES, MARCOS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/416,526

Applicant(s)

LEHTONEN ET AL.

Examiner

Marcos L Torres

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2683

4. Claims 1- 3, 6, 9-10, 12-14, 18, 20-21 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti in view of Friedmann.

As to claim 1, Sonti discloses a method of automatically configuring services for a subscriber within a communication system, comprising the step of: sensing an external parameter (see column 8, lines 25-29); choosing for the particular subscriber, a configuration of communication services from a plurality of configurations (see column 5, lines 32-44); and using the chosen configuration in respect of the subscriber, wherein said choosing is performed in dependence on a pre-defined criterion and the sensed external parameter (see column 1, lines 57-60). Sonti do not specifically disclose said choosing is automatically performed. Friedmann discloses configuration choosing is automatically performed (see col. 3, lines 51-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Friedmann teachings with Sonti system for an easier and more reliable system.

As to claims 2 and 3, Sonti discloses a method wherein the plurality of configurations is dependent upon the subscriber and wherein the pre-defined criterion is dependent upon the subscriber (see column 6, lines 7-11).

As to claim 6, Sonti discloses a method wherein a configuration is designated to be used in the event that no other configurations meet the pre-defined criterion (see column 5, lines 62-65).

As to claim 9, Sonti discloses a method wherein the pluralities of configurations are stored in a central database of a communication system (see column 5, lines 13-15).

As to claim 10, Sonti discloses that his method wherein the configurations are stored central database is a Home Location Register and anticipated that it could be a different system (see column 5, lines 40-41 and column 9, lines 9-14).

As to claim 12, Sonti discloses a method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the time (see column 1, lines 57-60).

As to claim 13, Sonti discloses a method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the location of the mobile station (see column 1, lines 57-60).

As to claim 14, Sonti discloses a method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the equipment identity of the mobile station (see column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 1).

As to claim 18, Sonti discloses an apparatus, for use in a communication system, comprising a register of subscribers to the communication system (see column 4, lines 56-65); a register of alternative configurations (see column 6, lines 31-36); sensing means for sensing an external parameter (see column 1, lines 56-60); means for automatically choosing one of the alternative configurations in response to said sensing means and a predefined criterion (see column 8, lines 25-29); and means for using the chosen configuration in respect of a particular subscriber (see column 3, lines 12-48).

As to claim 20, Sonti discloses an apparatus wherein the register of alternative configurations is associated with the subscriber (see column 2, lines 34-42).

As to claim 21, Sonti discloses an apparatus wherein pre-defined criterion is associated with the subscriber (see column 1, lines 56-60).

As to claims 26 and 27, Sonti discloses an apparatus in a communication system comprising: sensing means for sensing at least one external parameter; register means for storing predefined criteria for a mobile station (see col. 8, lines 25-29). Sonti do not specifically disclose processing means for automatically choosing a configuration for the mobile station based on the sensed at least one external parameter and the predefined criterion. Friedmann discloses processing means for automatically choosing a configuration for the mobile station based on the sensed at least one external parameter and the predefined criterion (see col. 3, lines 51-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Friedmann teachings with Sonti system for an easier and more reliable system.

5. Claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, 15-17, 19, 23-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti in view of Friedmann as applied to claims 1- 3, 6, 9-10, 12-14, 18, 20-21 and 26-27 above, and further in view of Buhrmann ('778).

As to claim 4, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for a method wherein the choosing is performed each time a call is made. Buhrmann discloses a method wherein the choosing is performed each time a call is made (see column 11, lines 9-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these features to the modified Sonti system for a more versatile system.

As to claim 5, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for a method wherein the plurality of configurations are ranked in order of priority such that

Art Unit: 2683

one of relatively higher priority which satisfies the criterion is used before one of relatively lower priority which also satisfies the criterion. Buhrmann discloses a method wherein the plurality of configurations are ranked in order of priority such that one of relatively higher priority which satisfies the criterion is used before one of relatively lower priority which also satisfies the criterion (see column 8, lines 20-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the Buhrmann features to the modified Sonti system for the simple purpose of increasing the flexibility of the system.

As to claim 7, Sonti do not specifically disclose a method wherein the automatic process may be manually overridden to use a configuration. However the use of manually override an automatic process is a common and well known technique, for example stopping a voice mail system, silence an incoming call, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this feature to the modified Sonti system for more convenience.

As to claim 8, Sonti do not specifically disclose a method wherein use of a certain configuration is not permitted according to a predefined rule. However, denial of a service or features when they are not valid in predefined rule is a common and well-known technique. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this feature to the modified Sonti system to minimize errors.

As to claims 11, 25 and 30, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the

date. Buhrmann discloses a method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the date (see column 6, lines 32-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine these techniques to further automate the modified Sonti system.

As to claim 15 and 16, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the number or type called. 15. Buhrmann discloses a method wherein the predefined criterion is dependent upon the number or type called (see column 8, lines 25-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Buhrmann to the modified system of Sonti for a more versatile system.

As to claim 17, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for a method wherein a configuration is chosen according to a plurality of predefined criteria. Buhrmann discloses a method wherein a configuration is chosen according to a plurality of predefined criteria (see column 8, lines 5-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Buhrmann to the modified system of Sonti for an easier updating system.

As to claim 19, Sonti discloses an apparatus wherein said registers form part of the Home Location Register (HLR). Sonti do not specifically disclose the use of his system in a GSM communication system. However, it would be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the modified Sonti system in an equivalent communication system.



As to claim 23, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for an apparatus or method wherein the external parameter is a hardware parameter.

Buhrmann discloses an apparatus or method wherein the external parameter is a hardware parameter (see column 6, lines 43-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a hardware parameter to the modified Sonti system for more enhanced functions.

As to claim 24, Sonti discloses a communication system comprising: a Mobile Services Switching Center (MSC) (see fig. 1, #34), the MSC including a Home Location Register (HLR) (see col. 5, lines 13-14, fig 1, #74); a base station controller operatively connected to the MSC; a base station operatively connected to the base station controller (see fig. 1, #40); and a mobile station operatively connected to the base station (see fig. 1, #30), the mobile station having capability for sensing at least one external parameter, a configuration of communication services for the mobile station being chosen from a plurality of configurations based on a pre-defined criterion and the sensed at least one external parameter (see col. 8, lines 25-29). Sonti do not disclose that the configuration is automatically chosen. Friedman discloses that the configuration is automatically chosen (see col. 3, lines 51-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the Friedmann teachings with Sonti system for an easier and more reliable system.

As to claims 28 and 29, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the method wherein the plurality of individual service arrangements further comprise at least one of speech services, SMS messaging, international calls barred,

international calls barred except to home country, data transfer rate, fax services, High Speed Circuit Switched Data (HSCSD), General Packet Radio Services (GPRS), and outgoing calls barred. Sonti discloses the method wherein the plurality of individual service arrangements further comprise at least one of speech services, SMS messaging, international calls barred, international calls barred except to home country, data transfer rate, fax services, High Speed Circuit Switched Data (HSCSD), General Packet Radio Services (GPRS), and outgoing calls barred (see col. 11, lines 34-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these features to the modified Sonti system for enhanced multiple services.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti in view of Friedmann as applied to claims 1- 3, 6, 9-10, 12-14, 18, 20-21 and 26-27 above, and further in view of Hagar.

As to claim 22, Sonti discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the apparatus wherein the external parameter is an environmental parameter. Hagar discloses an telecommunication apparatus wherein the external parameter is an environmental parameter (see col. 1, lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the Hagar teachings to the modified Sonti system for an enhanced multi feature communication system.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Reichelt U.S. Patent 6,295,447 discloses a method and system for enabling the control of execution of features in a telecommunication network.
- b. Vossler U.S. Patent 6,317,593 discloses an intelligent cellular telephone function.
- c. Irvin U.S. Patent 6,195,568 discloses a radiotelephone adapted to the identity of its user.
- d. Valliani U.S. Patent 6,311,063 discloses a method of and system for emulation of multiple subscriber profiles on a single mobile phone in a wireless telecommunication network.
- e. Choquet U.S. Patent 6,178,324 discloses a method of adapting the operation of a subscriber identity module to one or more interfaces of a mobile radio communication terminal.
- f. Huotari U.S. Patent 6,044,264 discloses a method for activating intelligent network services in a mobile communication system, and a mobile communication system.
- g. Miller U.S. Patent 6,141,563 discloses a SIM card secured subscriber unit.
- h. Buhrmann U.S. Patent 5,903,845 discloses a personal information manager for updating telecommunication subscriber profile.

8. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/416,526. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been

Art Unit: 2683

finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306

For formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II  
2121 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, VA

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcos L Torres whose telephone number is 703-305-1478. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm alt. Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William G Trost can be reached on 703-305-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Marcos L Torres  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2683

Mlt  
April 21, 2003

  
WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600